



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7a
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/308,223	08/12/1999	GEORG KALLMEYER	P8341-9011	5876

6449 7590 11/01/2005

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

FETTEROLF, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/308,223	Applicant(s) KALLMEYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD	Art Unit 1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 13 and 15-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 15-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1642

Kallmeyer *et al.*

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/02/2005 has been entered.

Claims 13 and 15-36 are currently pending and under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 9/02/2005 is acknowledged and has been partially considered. In the instant case, the information disclosure statement fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information which has not been initialed has not been considered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action of 6/04/2002.

Rejections Maintained:

Claims 13, 15-18, 22-36 **remain** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andya *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,267,958, March 1996) in view of Michaelis *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,919,443, June 1995) for the reasons of record in the Non-Final Office Action filed on 12/18/2001

Art Unit: 1642

(pages 5-6) and the Final Office Action filed on 03/08/2005 (pages 4-5) and for the reasons set forth below.

In reference to the previous action (12/18/2001) which held that it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lyophilizate of Andya *et al.* so as to include an amino sugar as taught by Michaelis *et al.*, Applicant's have requested the reconsideration of the amendment filed on June 7, 2005 and the arguments submitted therein. Applicant's submit that the claims, as amended, are directed to stabilizing an antibody lyophilizate with an amino sugar, at least one amino acid, and a surfactant. Applicant's further contend that Andya *et al.* does not teach or suggest the use of an amino sugar to stabilize a lyophilizate of an antibody. Moreover, Applicant's argue that this failure in Andya *et al.* is not cured by the teachings of Michaelis *et al.*, which is directed to stabilization of lyophilized pharmaceutical preparations of G-CSF. Furthermore, Applicant's assert that although Michaelis *et al.* discloses the use of an amino sugar as a stabilizing agent, the reference is directed to stabilizing C-CSF, a non-glycosylated single polypeptide chain G-CSF, which is very different from the complex antibodies of the currently claimed invention. Thus, Applicants contend that there is no motivation to combine the cited reference to teach or suggest the use of an amino sugar in stabilizing an antibody lyophilizate as the amended claims.

These arguments have been carefully considered but are not found persuasive.

First, the Examiner agrees with Applicants submission that the Andya *et al.* reference does not specifically teach or suggest the use of an amino sugar to stabilize a lyophilizate of an antibody. Moreover, the Examiner agrees with Applicants contention that Michaelis *et al.* teach the stabilization of a lyophilized pharmaceutical preparation of G-CSF, which is chemically different from an antibody. However, it must be remembered that the references are relied upon in combination and are not meant to be considered separately as in a vacuum. It is the combination of all of the cited and relied upon references which make up the state of the art with regard to the claimed invention. Furthermore, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference and it is not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references; but rather the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In the instant case, both

Art Unit: 1642

references represent analogous teachings comprising the preparation of stable pharmaceutical compositions. Thus, while Applicants contend that there is no motivation to combine the cited references because Michaelis *et al.* teach using an amino sugar for the preparation of lyophilizate of a polypeptide which is chemically different from the presently claimed antibody, the suggestion to combine was based on the advantages of an improved lyophilizate since Michaelis *et al.* makes the surprising discovery that is possible to produce stable forms of pharmaceutical agents when amino sugars are used as additives and further that solid preparations which contain amino sugars as auxiliary agents can be frozen or even stored at increased temperatures with no significant loss of protein quality (12/18/01, page 6). Therefore, Applicant's claimed invention fails to patentably distinguish over the state of the art represented by the cited references taken in combination.

Therefore, NO claim is allowed

Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1642


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF


JEFFREY SIEW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
10/24/05